# COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. X. No. 11.] LONDON, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 1806. [PRICE 10D.


"This writer" [the Morning Post man] "is a defender of vice; an open propagator of the principles of "immorality; and, he would, in my opinion, be a much fitter object of the vengeance of the VICE SO-"CIETY, than are the poor creatures, who vend ginger-bread and apples on a Sunday, only because "necessity compels them to work all the rest of the week. It was for the purpose of combating this most "shocking slave; it was for the purpose of preventing his vile notions, notions that would have disgraced a "Russian, from gaining ground amongst the thoughtless crowds of the metropolis, and thence working "their way into the country; this was the purpose for which my remarks upon the "Delicate Investigation" "were made, and not for the purpose of giving, by way of insinuation, an opinion hostile to the party said "to have been accused."——POLITICAL REGISTER, Vol. 10. p. 269.



## SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

BATTLE IN CALABRIA.——The official account of the proceedings of the British army in Calabria will be found in a subsequent part of this sheet; and, from that account, it is impossible that we should not derive the greatest satisfaction; for, though the loss of the enemy, when compared with the whole of his forces, be but trifling; and, though the victory which we have gained will, it is to be feared, retard but very little the accomplishment of the designs of Napoleon, yet, this victory is not only a victory of Englishmen over Frenchmen; but, it is a victory, which, without being too sanguine, without exposing ourselves to the charge of boasting, we may hold forth as a *proof*, of the *decided superiority* of English over French troops. The victory, in any other light, is of little or no value; but, in this light, it is valuable beyond all price; and the gratitude of the country ought to be clearly evinced towards the officers, under whom it was gained.——There are, at this moment, in the king's dominions, 500,000 men like those, who, with the gallant COLONEL KEMPT at their head, drove back, at the point of the bayonet, Frenchmen more than double their number. These islands contain 500,000 such men. What, with these men; or, only one-third part of these men, well armed, well trained, and WELL COMMANDED, have we to fear? And what need have we of FOREIGNERS to defend our country?

NEGOCIATIONS FOR PEACE.——If these negociations should fail, and that they will fail there is, I think, but little doubt, a FOURTH COALITION will, apparently, be the consequence, it being now certain, that the Emperor of Russia has refused to ratify the treaty negoeiated by Mr. D'OUBRIL.——Whether D'OUBRIL surpassed his powers, or whether the mind of the Emperor underwent a change after the giving of those powers, it is, of course, not easy to determine; nor can it, as yet, be a fact publicly known, whether the interference of our cabinet has had any weight in producing the event; but, if a FOURTH COALITION should take place; if new treaties of subsidy should be entered into by us; if the country is to undergo another year or two of draining for the sake of putting the continental armies in motion; if this is to be, I cannot help fearing, that it will be by mere chance, if at all, that England will escape unconquered from the effects of such a coalition?——Who are to be *parties* to the coalition? Russia, Austria, and England? So they were before; and, at a time, too, when the House of Austria was in possession of the Tyrol, and was able at once to push forward her armies to the banks of the Rhine. What hope is there, then, that a similar coalition would be able to effect any thing against France at this time? What ground is there, whereon to build a rational expectation of success from such a coalition? For my part, I can see none. Am I told, that Prussia will make a party to the coalition? I first ask, how we are to prevail upon Prussia to give up Hanover? Or, shall we, for the sake of obtaining the aid of Prussia, give up to her the object, and the sole object, of the war which we are now waging against her? This I should be surprised to see, especially under an administration that calls itself *Whig*; but, if all difficulties should be removed between us and Prussia, and if Prussia should join us and the other powers in a war against France, the consequence, in my opinion, would be, that Prussia herself would, in a very short space of time, cease to be an independent power. The great talk about the "*immense army* of Prussia" we hear from those, who seem to be totally unacquainted with the nature of that army; with the means by which it is raised and kept together; and, indeed, this is the only way of accounting for that great reliance that some persons are disposed to place upon the mili-

tary power of Prussia. But, neither the Prussian government nor the Emperor of the French is ignorant upon this subject; and, hence it is, that the former is in no haste to get into a war with the latter, and that the latter takes very little pains to avoid giving offence to the former. The army of Prussia makes, I dare say, as fine a shew upon parade as it does in the columns of our newspapers; but, it is formidable only in show; and by show the French are not to be intimidated.——As to Russia and Austria, one would have thought, that, after what we have seen, within this twelvemonth, no man would have been found upon the face of the earth foolish enough to entertain any hope of their being able again to meet France in the field; and, in short, he who expects from another continental coalition any thing but the creation of more French kings seems to me to be inflicted with a most mischievous species of madness.——"What then," some one will say, "are we to do; for, "you have frequently told us, that, the re- "lative situation of England and France be- "ing what it now is, England can never "enjoy one moment of real peace, though "she may make as many treaties as she has "generals upon the staff." I have said so; and my opinion remains unchanged; but, because I wish to see the relative situation of England and France altered, does it follow, that I regard a FOURTH COALITION as the means of effecting that alteration? "But, "what, then, would *you* do, if you had the "sole rule in England?" Why, since it is now too late to arrest the progress of France upon the continent, I would bend my whole attention to the placing of England *in such a state as to be able to await, with arms in her hands, for the day when that progress should, of itself, have enfeebled France.* And, in order to accomplish this object, I would first set about the reduction of every expense not absolutely necessary; and, having lightened the hand of taxation as much as I could in that way, I would make addition upon addition to the deduction from the dividends, commonly called the tax upon the funds. By the operation of these measures the nation would soon find itself relieved from that pressure, which makes it constantly sigh for peace, without any regard whatever to its honour or its safety. By these measures 150,000 tax-gatherers would be sent back to till the land, to ply the oar, or to work in the making of goods. By these measures the poor-houses would once more be depopulated, and the million and a half of wretches who now inhabit them, would again become something in society.——I am aware, that I shall be again reproached with a wish to see the funds destroyed; but, to those who so reproach me, I should like to put this question, Can you, in your present state, continue to make war for ten or twenty years longer? If they answer in the affirmative, they are consistent in their reproaches, or, at least, they are excusable. But, if they say "NO," and tell me, that they hope to enjoy peace, then they are inconsistent, unless they prove to me that the reasoning which I have frequently made use of upon the subject, and which I will now repeat, be false.——My opinion is, that, while the funding system remains, and while France retains her present relative power, we can have no real peace, because, at all times when we are not at open and decided war with her, she will have the power of draining England of the fruit of its land and its labour, through the channel of the funds.——In support of this opinion I first lay down the position, that, if there were a person, no matter who, who had the power of causing the funds to rise and to fall at his pleasure, and who, of course, knew the exact time, when they would rise and fall, that person would have the power of drawing into his own hands, by degrees, the whole of the 29 millions a year which are raised in taxes to defray the expenses of the national debt. If this position be granted, and, I think it will not be denied, the question that presents itself for determination is, whether, peace existing between England and France, Napoleon will have something approaching to that power; and, that this question must be answered in the affirmative, every one will, I think, agree, when it is considered how many and how strong will be our motives for avoiding a renewal of hostilities; how regardless he need be upon the subject; how numerous are the grounds upon which he may dispute with us; and how little he will have to dread from any resentment which his injustice or his insults may excite. If, in the present state of things, we make peace, it will, on our part, be a peace of necessity, and, on his part, a peace of policy. The time, during which it will last, will be occupied with diplomatic discussions. There will be a negociation, upon some point or other, continually on foot. As we shall be constantly endeavouring to avoid a rupture, he will alternately *threaten* and *soothe* us, as long as he shall find it useful to his views to preserve the name of peace; and, of the effect which that threatening and that soothing will produce upon our funds, he, and he alone, will be able to take advantage,

having it always in his power to cause the intelligence of his threats and his soothings to transpire at the 'Change at any moment that he may find it most conducive to the object that he may wish to accomplish.——It is true, that his local situation, the necessity he will be under of trusting to agents, the space of time required between each speculation, together with some other circumstances that might be mentioned, would render the work more difficult, and of slower progress, in his hands, than in the hands of an individual, living in this country, and possessing an absolute power as to the rise and fall of the funds; but, due allowance made for the effect of every difficulty, I, for my part, can see no reason, why he may not, in the course of two years of nominal peace, draw from this country, through the channel of the funds, *five or six millions* of the real wealth of the nation. If it be asked me, "*what* it is that he will thus "draw?" And, if some one should observe, that he will merely become the proprietor of stock instead of that same stock being the property of other persons, and that the nation will have no higher rate of interest to pay him, than it has to pay to any other fund-holder: if this observation be made, I answer, that, certainly it would be a great injury to the country, if so large a portion of the interest of the national debt were taken from its own people and carried annually into the treasury of its enemy; especially under the present law, which exempts from the fund-tax the property of nobody but *foreigners* and *his gracious Majesty*. But, still, the question recurs, "*what* is it that he would thus draw out of "the nation?" Not the certificates of the right to receive dividends; not the little oblong snips of crumpled and dirty paper that now constitute our English money; no, these would be of no use to him, nor would they be any loss to us. He would be no fund-holder, except *from fall to rise*; his winnings (and he would always win) would be converted into *gold*, and this gold would be derived from the land, and the labour of the people of this country. The operation is so obvious and so simple, that it is next to impossible for any one not to perceive and to understand it. Napoleon wins a million of pounds in the English funds. He possesses, of course, stock to that amount. He sells the stock. Gold he cannot get for it in England; nor would it so well suit him if he could. But, in exchange for his stock, he gets bills upon Hamburgh, or elsewhere. These bills are paid out of the proceeds of goods made in and sent from England, or of produce sent from the Colonies of England. And, thus, through the channel of the funds, does he draw the fruit of our land and our labour, as effectually and as evidently as the Pope formerly drew a revenue from that land and that labour, or, as if we were to pay him so much a year under the name of a tribute.——Clear, however, as all this appears to my mind, I have heard it denied; the denial not supported, indeed, by any thing resembling an argument, but merely by the observation, that, if France can, by such means, lay as under a tribute now, she would have done so, in times of peace, heretofore, the funding system having existed for more than a century, and France having, during the whole of that century, been full as much the enemy of England, as she now is, or as she can possibly become hereafter. But, those who make this observation, do not seem to perceive, that there has, of late years, been any increase in the magnitude of the debt, and, of course, in the means of drawing away the fruit of the land and the labour of the nation; and, if they do perceive this, they surely overlook the main fact upon which I proceed, to wit, *that the relative situation of England and France was never before what it now is*. The Kings of France would, at all times, have been disposed to *threaten* and *to soothe* us alternately, and therefrom to profit, in the same way, that it has been above predicted that Napoleon will profit; but, such was their situation relatively to us; so great, comperatively, was our power of *punishing* them for any act of injustice or of arrogance; for any of those steps that they might have taken for the purpose of drawing away our wealth through the funds, that they *dared* not take any such step. Previous to the year 1793; previous to the wars of Pitt; previous to the days of the power of that minister, to pay whose debts we are now taxed; previous to those days, England had always the power, either with her own hand, or by the hands of others, to inflict vengeance upon France, if the case justified the measure. France was, until the ill fated hour when the showy and shallow-brained and conceited and arrogant Pitt first made war upon her, always indeed, one of the great powers of Europe; but, she never was any more than *one* of those powers, some others of which England was always able to bring into the field against her, and thereby to *compel* her to act justly and with moderation. Is this the case now? Has the man, to raise a monument to whom, and to pay whose debts, we are taxed, left us with any such capacity? Do

we now possess the power of inflicting, in any way whatever, vengeance upon France? Are we able to compel her to act with justice and moderation? And, if these questions be answered in the negative, what is there in the experience of former times to resist the force of my argument? At the peace of Amiens England and France were placed in a relative situation entirely new. Whoever contemplated that situation, and formed a correct judgment upon it, must, in my opinion, have foreseen, that it was impossible for the two nations to remain at peace; that it was impossible for England to enjoy any of the benefits of peace; that it was impossible for her even to experience one hour's real peace again, *until that relative situation should be changed.* There were two ways of changing it: the one was, by forcing France back again to something like her former share of power; the other, by adding to our own powers of resistance. The former has been since tried, in a THIRD COALITION, and it has failed; the latter would require various great measures, but the greatest and most effectual of all is that which I have so frequently and so strenuously recommended, and by the means of which alone France can possibly be prevented from acquiring the sinews of war by a tribute raised upon England in time of peace.——Having now given, and with as much perspicuity as I am master of, my reasons for believing, that we never shall again experience an hour's peace or safety, while the Funding System exists, I beg leave to conclude with requesting those, who may differ from me in opinion, and who may think it worth their while publickly to express that difference, not to imagine, that my arguments, however feeble they may be, will, in the mind of any man of sense, be overset by shrew-like abuse. I shall be, upon this occasion, as I am upon

lothers, ready to hear, and to communiateto the public, any thing that may be urged in opposition to my facts or my reasoning; but, every angry writer must excuse me, if I refuse to acknowledge myself mistaken, merely because those facts and that reasoning happen to thwart his interest or his humour.

" DELICATE INVESTIGATION."—— Upon this subject, I should now have said nothing, had not the writer, upon whose conduct, respecting it, I have so often had occasion to remark, made a violent effort to connect it with another, to wit, "THE BIRTH-DAY OF " THE DUKE OF CLARENCE," and my comments (in the preceding number of the Register) upon a publication bearing that title. Since, however, the former subject has been revived, I will, before I proceed to the latter, just put three plain questions to this writer, and those questions, until he give a plain and direct answer to each, I will, without saying any thing more, repeat as often as he makes any publication touching the matter.

1st. WHO *did you mean to designate, when you talked of the* HIGH AUTHORITY *whence had proceeded an* INSTIGATION *to prefer false accusations against the Princess of Wales, and also attempts at* SUBORNATION *for that purpose?*

2d. *Seeing that you repeatedly complained against, and bitterly reviled, all those whom you suspected of a wish to keep the Report and Evidence, touching the Princess of Wales, from the public; seeing that you assured us, that the Princess of Wales had written to the King, urgently requesting that there might be no delay in publishing the said Report and Evidence; and, seeing thatyou have now told us, that the said Report and Evidence have been officially delivered to the Princess of Wales; seeing all this,* WHAT IS THE REASON *why the Report and Evidence* ARE NOT NOW PUBLISHED?

3d. WHAT DO YOU YOURSELF MEAN *by the words* " TRIFLING LEVI-" TIES?"

Leaving my friend CALIBAN of the Morning Post to answer these questions when he can find a moment's relaxation from his more important and sublime lucubrations, I shall now, first insert, and next make a remark or two upon, that spstem of court-morality, the principles of which he has broached, and promulgated in his paper of the 11th instant, where he comments on my remarks, in the foregoing Register, upon a scandalous publication, entitled, " THE DUKE OF CLARENCE'S BIRTH-DAY."—— After referring to those remarks, and giving his description of their tendency, he proceeds thus.—— " Undoubtedly, in a strict " moral point of view, Princes have the " same obligations on them as other in-" dividuals. But we believe we may, without " dreading the fear of contradiction, chal-" lenge history to produce a more moral set " of Princes than ours; A MORE MO-" RAL FAMILY, whether royal or pri-" vate. Restrained as our Princes are by law " from entering into wedlock as their in-" clinations may lead them, A SORT OF " LATITUDE MAY NATURALLY BE " SUPPOSEDTOBEALLOWEDTHEM-" in a case where a law of nature is, in a " great degree, violated for the interest of " the State. All who are acquainted with " history know, that when the Clergy were

" aestrained from marriage for the interest " of the Church, CONCUBINAGE WAS " PERMITTED; and even in this country " this species of connection WAS EN- " FORCED AT THE INSTANCE OF " THE PUBLIC, for the preservation of " their wives and daughters, from the at- " tacks of the Clergy. Our Princes, " though restricted from marrying accord- " ing to their wishes, have never IN " ANY ONE INSTA CE VIOLATED " THE SANCTUARY OF ANY SUB- " JECT'S BED, OR FAMILY. If they " have fallen into any irregularities, that rigid " morality would condemn, human nature " will excuse them. This is reasoning, " which every mind ought to furnish " to itself in silence, and which, however " just and natural, we should be ashamed " to copy from the pages of our best histo- " rians, if it were not necessary in order to " shew the falsehood of the pretended mo- " rality, by the cant of which this writer " has attempted to bring one of the Mem " bers of the Royal Family into disgrace. " But the gross and ungenerous indecency " with which this writer attacks a family " of innocent children, surpasses all his " former instances of unmanly violence, al- " most even that of his determined malice " against the Princess of Wales Children " of the description of those we have alluded " to, *have at all times, and in all Monar- " chies, been educated as persons of the* " HIGHEST RANK; and instead of " Its being matter of blame to give them " such an education, every one who has a " spark of nature in him will feel that it " would be most unnatnral in the father not " to do so. It is matter of history that " SUCH children have done EMINENT " SERVICES, not only to individual states, " but TO THE WORLD IN GENERAL. " But for the valour of Don John of Aus- " tria, all Europe *might* have been reduced " under the Mahometan yoke, two cen- " turies ago. We say this not to encourage " the" " creation of such children" mock- " ing the great work of the Almighty, as " this writer chooses to express himself in " the sport of his hypocritical and blaspl e- " mous morality, but to defend the pro- " priety of giving, when it has PLEASED " PROVIDENCE to send them, the best " education the circumstances of the parents " will permit.—The vulgar and indecent " attack made on the mother of those chil- " dren, is of that unmanly description, that " it will itself drawn down on the author " the just contempt of every one who reads " it. It does not make a part of our object " to notice it more particularly. It is only " the disloyal and *revolutionary* system of " vilifying the Royal Family on every possi- " ble occasion, that we wish particularly to " point out to public notice; it is only the " JACOBINICAL DOCTRINES and LE- " VELLING principles of this writer, that " we wish to watch, and to warn the world " against, that the confusion which they are " calculated to produce may be prevented. " Is what we pay for the maintenance of " our numerous and illustrious Royal Family " to be compared in any degree with what " the victims of the oppression of Buona- " parté pay to support the profligacy and " prodigality of his relatives Are we " WORSE off, under the payment of our " taxes, and the interest of our public " debt, than those who have been plun- " dered of *all their property*, and of the " *lives of so many dear relatives*, by econo- " mists who led the successive revolutionary " governments of France?"——Mr. CALIBAN, according to his usual custom, wanders here a good deal from his subject; but, to follow him a step or two in his wanderings, does he think, that the people of England ought to be *satisfied*, at being *not worse off* than those " who have been," as *he* says, " plundered of *all* their *property*, and of " *the lives of their relations?*" Does he think that this argument is of cogency sufficient to reconcile men to the additional grants, recently made to several branches of the Royal Family? Does he think that an argument like this will tend to urge the people of England to expose their breasts to the bayonets of an invader? If he could make men believe, that there remains no *private property* in France, and that the relations of *all the people* have been murdered; does he really think, that the people of England ought to find consolation in being able to say, that they are *not worse off* than the people of France?——Now, as to " *re-* " *volutionary*" and " *levelling*" views, which this gentleman, Mr. CALIBAN, thinks proper. to ascribe to me, the public will not forget, that it was a publication, representing the Prince of Wales, his Royal Brothers, the Lord Chancellor of England, a Countess, a Countess's Daughter, and a Baroness, as being seated at a table with a *play-actress* and *her* children; the public will not, if Mr. CALIBAN does, forget, that it was upon this *levelling* representation; upon this representation so shockingly degrading to rank, dignity, and character, that I bestowed my reprobation.——From the politics of this writer, who considers this reprobation of mine as proceeding from

"*Jacobinical Principles*," let us now turn to his morality.——Upon his two facts, 1st., that the world does not contain, and never has contained, "*a more moral family* "than the Royal Family of England;" and, 2nd, that "our princes never have, *in any* "*one instance, violated the sanctuary of any* "*subject's bed or family*;" upon these facts, far be it from me to entertain the least inclination to contradict him; nor, indeed am I able to discover any very *loyal* motive for his thus gratuitously stating these facts. And, as for as the *fact* goes, with respect to the "sort of latitude," which he supposes our Princes to indulge in, I have nothing to say, nor have I said any thing, my comments having been expressly confined to an *audacious*, an *open*, a *printed*, and a *published representation* of what I considered and treated as false; but, of his *doctrine*, as touching the point, I have no scruple to express my abhorrence, and, in so doing, I do, I trust, express the feelings of the British public. "A sort of latitude is," he tells us, "allowed in a case, where *a law of* "*nature* is violated for the interest of the "State." But, what statute is there which does not, in a greater or less degree, violate the law of nature? Is not the law of nature violated by the Game Laws, by the Revenue Laws, by the Enclosure Laws, by all the laws creating and securing property, by every law for preventing promiscuous interourse; and, in short, is it not by an universel violation of the law of nature that men have been formed into families and states? And yet, this profound politician, this learned casuist, this zealous Anti-Jacobin, this ra iler against Tom Paine and Jack Cade scruples not to assert that a *sort of latitude* is allowed in cases where a law of nature has been violated for the interest of the state!——As to his assertions respecting "the concubinage not only *per-* "*mitted* amongst the clergy, but *enforced* "by the public," they are too notoriously false, and too despicably stupid to be dwelt on; and, as to his eulogium on royal bastards, where is the reader into whose mind instances innumerable will not rush of the fatal consequences, which, by the bastards of kings and princes, have been produced in the world? Against his instance of Don John of Austria we may place that of the rebellious bastard of Charles II, who skulked away from the ranks of the poor-wretches whom he had deluded from their allegiance, and who, though bearing the title of Duke, and aspiring to the throne, died hidden in a ditch with half-chewed peas in his mouth; a death quite worthy of the baseness of his birth. But, it is that general defence, and open eulogy, of bastardy, implied in this writers' remarks, that demands the severest of our censure. He is, as was before observed, in the words chosen for my motto, an open defender of vice and immorality; and, I will venture to say, that he is the very first man, in this country, who has ever dared to send forth such a defence in an open sheet, to be laid upon the tables of his customers, there to be read by their sons, their daughters, and their servants.

DR. MC. ARTHUR.——In a subsequent page, a letter will be found from a gentleman, remarking upon the note in page 353 of the present volume, into which he was introduced by MR. COCHRANE JOHNSTONE, and in which he appears to think that he was treated with contempt, merely because he has no *noble* blood running in his veins. I assure him, that, though I read the note before it was published, and have read it since, it left no such impression upon my mind; and that, if it had, I myself should not have been backwaad in asserting our plebian rights. But, is DR. MC. ARTHUR quite sure; has he examined well the bottom of his heart, and is he quite sure, that it is not his over anxiety to be thought something more than what PAINE calls "*a noble of nature*;" is he quite sure that it is not this anxiety that has made him discover in Mr. JOHNSTONE's note the marks of a sentiment foreign from that gentleman's mind; and, indeed, is he sure that it was not this very same anxiety, an anxiety "to be thought familiar with great men," that first led him into that correspondence which finally brought upon him the lash, under which he now appears to writhe?——There was, from the beginning, no need of any thing being said, on his part, except a few words, merely to explain the mistake that he had fallen into with regard to the person of Colonel Gordon. His letter to the public went farther; it conveyed censure on Mr. COCHRANE JOHNSTONE's conduct; and, indeed, it was but too evident, that, in disclaiming a man, who had to contend with the Duke of York, DR. MC. ARTHUR was resolved not to be the hindmost.——As to the *Doctor's degree*, I really did not think it was an unfit object for a good-natured joke, having frequently heard of such things being obtained (I will not say where) for a cast-off coat, or an old pair or two of shoes, bestowed upon the residentiary dignitaries, and having more than once entertained the intention of decorating my printer's devil with the title of *Doctor of Laws*.

## CATHOLIC CLAIMS.

### LETTER V.

SIR;——The very extraordinary events, both foreign and domestic, which we have lately witnessed, render it altogether unnecessary for me to pursue beyond the limits of my present letter, my intended remarks on that part of your parliamentary report, which relates to the Catholic question. The advocates of the Catholic claims, are now in possession of the first offices of the state; and I cannot for a moment doubt that, under the present new and unexampled circumstances of the country, every measure, worthy of British statesmen, will be taken to cement the union, and consolidate the strength of the empire. Those, who so generously espoused the cause of four millions of their fellow subjects, and so triumphantly supported the grounds of the Catholic petition, will now feel the most urgent calls of policy, as well as liberality and justice, to carry into effect their beneficent and patriotic designs. The absolute necessity of giving to every subject of the King, without any distinction of religious belief, every possible motive of interest, in the preservation of his country, must *now* be deeply impressed on the minds of all those who are capable of forming an opinion on the question. It was observed, Sir, by a noble lord, during the discussion of the Catholic claims, that as almost every part of Europe holding communion with the Pope was subject to France, it was extremely inexpedient to grant political power to the Catholics of Ireland, but that it was prudent to await the result of the contest in which we are engaged. (Lord Hawkesbury's speech p. 683.) What the final result of this dangerous contest may be, God only knows. But without waiting long, we have beheld a dreadful catastrophe; for which, I believe, we were but little prepared. We have seen a formidable confederacy, consisting of the first nations of Europe, broken to fragments, and dissolved with a degree of rapidity unexampled in the annals of mankind. A Colossus of power, altogether without precedent, since the days of Roman greatness, is raised to the dismay of the present generation; the authority of an implacable enemy is settled on a firmer basis; and the assembled majesty of the crowned heads of Europe are bowing with abject submission to a self-erected Emperor, who has but just emerged from the obscurity of private life. This is, indeed, a new order of things. *Magnus ab integro sæclorum nascitur ordo.*—We are now freed from the care of superintending the concerns of the Continent, and all our attention must be given to the preservation of our own country. If it be then true, that the Pope is a vassal of Napoleon, is that a reason for withholding from the Catholics of Ireland *civil rights and liberties*? Is it not an additional inducement to conciliate their affections, and secure their attachment by every possible concession?—I cannot, Sir, view but with extreme astonishment the many passages in your parliamentary report, in which, the greatest tribute of applause is bestowed upon the loyalty of the Catholics of Ireland, when I observe, on the other hand, that their connexion with the Pope, who is stated to be under the influence of France, is made use of, purposely to render their conduct suspicious. They are represented to be peaceable, and attached to the government of the country; and yet they are unfit to be trusted with power, because they obey the Pope, *as head of the Catholic church*. Surely such inconsistencies cannot be produced by the same head, though they may be occasionally uttered by the same mouth. It is now time to drop such absurd language, which can be disgraceful to those only who use it; but which is in the highest degree insulting to every Catholic in the universe. For it tends to propagate a belief, that the admission of the spiritual power of His Holiness, which is regarded by all Catholics as an *essential* term of communion, is incompatible with the authority of sovereigns, and independence of states.—It is not a matter of trifling curiosity, to read the different passages in your reports, concerning what is called with much affectation, "the foreign jurisdiction "of the Pope." I shall transcribe a most singular specimen of this kind from a speech, ascribed to Lord Ellenborough, after speaking of the different grants made to the Catholics during the present reign, the noble and learned lord proceeds in the following manner: "The only remaining emancipa-
" tion, which they (the Catholics) are capa-
" ble of receiving, must be acquired by an
" act of their own, by redeeming them-
" selves from the *foreign bondage and thral-*
" *dom*, under which they and their ances-
" tors have long so unworthily groaned;
" and from which, the state, as it has nei-
" ther imposed, nor continued it, has no
" adequate means of relieving them, con-
" sistently with the duty of self-preserva-
" tion, which it owes to itself. Every state
" claiming and exercising independent pow-
" ers of sovereignty, has incidentally be-
" longing to it, as such, the power of bind-
" ing its subjects by laws of its own, not

" only paramount to, but exclusive of any " authority or controul to be exercised by " any other state whatever. In so far as " any other state or person is allowed to " exercise an authority, breaking in upon " this exclusive and independent power of " legislation, and enforcement of authority " in one state, to that extent such a state so " intrenched upon, is not sovereign and in- " dependent, but admits itself to be subor- " dinate to, and dependent upon the other. " The declaration contained in the oath of " supremacy, which expresses a denial and " remuneration of the existence of any " power and authority in respect of *eccle- " siastical and spiritual* matters, in any " foreign state, potentate, or person what- " soever, is but the affirmance of a proposi- " tion, which is logically and politically " true as an essential principle of indepen- " dent sovereignty, applicable not to this " government only, but to every other go- " vernment under the sun, which claims to " possess and exercise the powers of inde- " pendent sovereignty." (p. 807.) Such is the doctrine and language here ascribed to Lord Ellenborough. As to the independence of the state, *in all temporal matters*, no description of people can maintain it with more force than the Catholics. In the United Kingdom they are pledged to support it by the solemn sanction of an oath, which, upon the closest examination, will be found a more satisfactory test of their allegiance, than any given by the rest of his Majesty's subjects. But when the noble lord proceeds to consider all power and authority, in respect *to ecclesiastical and spiritual matters*, to be under the controul of the civil power. Does he, or do those, who think with him on this important point, apprehend the direct and inevitable consequences of such a principle? If the civil power possesses this exclusive jurisdiction *in spiritual matters*, as a part of independent sovereignty, it follows, that as temporal authority is the same in all places, it may enforce the creed of Pope Pius at Rome, the 39 articles in this country, and the Koran at Constantinople, and that those, who from conscientious motives, refuse to comply with these *spiritual* injunctions of the civil magistrate, are guilty of a breach of allegiance. On this principle, a lord chief justice in the dominions of Turkey, is bound to consider the jurisdiction of the Greek Patriarch as an infringement of the sovereign power of the state, and to repress by legal means, the public exercise of any authority *in spiritual matters*, if it does not proceed from the supreme head of the Mahommedan religion. According to this notion a very commodious rule of faith may easily be framed, which will be wonderfully adapted to all times and circumstances, and will clearly direct the honest believer in the right way As the power of the state is, in this system supreme, in *all matters both temporal and spiritual*, and as authority and obedience are reciprocal, it follows that every man has only to profess the religion of the country in which he is born, and implicitly to obey the jurisdiction of his sovereign in *spiritual concerns*, whatever he may be, a Jew or a Christian, a Catholic or a Protestant, a follower of Confulius or Mahomet. Such is the plain and natural consequence of the doctrine laid down by the noble and learned lord in the passage before us. But the absurdity of such a conduct is too obvious, to require any illustration. For it tends to make religion, which rests on the revelation of God, changeable and subject to all the vicissitudes of human governments. Again, Sir, if supreme jurisdiction *in all spiritual matters* is lodged in the state, it will follow by consequence that the care of our eternal salvation belongs to the civil magistrate. How far this is correct let Locke decide. Excuse the length of my quotation. " The common- " wealth," says he, " seems to me, to be a " society of men, constituted only for the " procuring, preserving, and advancing of " their own *civil* interests. Now, that the " whole jurisdiction of the magistrate " reaches only to these *civil* concernments, " and that all that civil power, right and do- " minion is bounded and confined to the " only care of promoting *these things*, and " that it neither can nor ought to be ex- " tended to the salvation of souls; these " following considerations seem to me " abundantly to demonstrate. First, be- " cause the care of souls is not committed " to the civil magistrate, any more than to " other men. In the second place, the " care of souls cannot belong to the civil " magistrate, because his power consists " only in outward force: but true and " saving religion consists in the inward per- " suasion of the mind. In the third place, " the care of the salvation of mens souls " cannot belong to the magistrate; because, " though a rigour of laws, and the force " of penalties were capable to convince and " change men's minds, yet, would thas not " help at all to the salvation of their souls. " For there being but one truth, one way " to heaven, what hope is there, that more " men would be led into it, if they had no " other rule to follow but the religion of " the court, and were put under a necessity

" to quit the light of their own reason, to " oppose the dictates of their own con- " sciences, and blindly to resign themselves " to the will of their governors, and to the " religion, which either ignorance, ambi- " tion, or superstition had chanced to esta- " blish in the countries where they were " born? These considerations, to omit many " others, seem to me sufficient to conclude " that all power of civil government relates " only to men's *civil interests*; is confined " to the care of the things of *this world*, " and hath nothing to do with the world to " come." (Locke's Letter on Toleration, p. 27 et seq. edit. Glasgow, 1757.)——But, Sir, you will ask me, does not this doctrine of the great philosopher militate against an ecclesiastical establishment, which is supported by the civil government? By no means. Civil governors are free to protect any mode of worship, they conscientiously believe to be the best; they may secure rights and immunities to the clergy, and exact even tithes for the support of its ministers: and in this sense they declare a mode of worship, the national religion. But they cannot force any mode of worship upon the subject; they cannot oblige a single individual, who chooses not to profess the national religion, to frequent the service, and to comply with the religious ordinances sanctioned by the state. Not all the powers of this land, can, with a shadow of right, compel Catholics, Jews, Methodists, and Quakers, to quit their chapels, synagogues, and conventicles, and repair to the church for the purpose of assisting at religious service. Though persons of all descriptions are totally subject to the *civil* ordinances of the state, such an interposition, as I allude to, would effect the right of conscience; a right above the controul of states and empires? So far have I shewn, without fear of contradiction, that spiritual jurisdiction, regarding the care of souls, forms no part of the power of the state, and consequently, that the admission of a spiritual supremacy in the civil magistrate cannot be considered as a duty of the subject. I now come to examine the proposition of the noble lord, which states that the renunciation of any spiritual power in any foreign state, potentate or person, is essential to the independence of every government under the sun; or, in other words, that the admission of the spiritual power of the Pope is incompatible with the independence of states. This proposition I shall very easily shew to be false. I have already demonstrated, that, though a state may protect any mode of worship, yet spiritual authority forms no part of its independent power. Spiritual jurisdiction is not connected with the nature of civil government, the object of which is, to secure by an impartial execution of laws, the good of the subject in all concerns of the present life. Spiritual jurisdiction, on the contrary, is directed to objects which extend their influence beyond the grave; to the care of souls, to instruction, the use of the sacraments, and the power of punishing offences by censures. If then, the power of the Pope, regards spiritual objects only, how can it interfere with the independence of states or sovereigns, who possess no claim to spiritual authority, and whose dominion is wholly of a temporal nature? If the power of the Pope does not interfere with that of sovereigns, and this clearly appears from the different nature of their claims, as well as from the solemn oath taken by the Catholics of the United Kingdom, the renunciation of this power is, *not* " the effirmence of a proposition logically and politically true, as an essential principle of true sovereignty." As to what the noble and learned lord says about the oaths and the power of absolution, an attentive perusal of the instrument, which was then the subject of debate, might have afforded him more correct information.—— If we carry our reflections still farther, on this most important point, we shall find, that the spiritual power of the Pope, is no more to be stigmatized as a *foreign jurisdiction*, incompatible with the rights of states and sovereigns, than that authority which was exercised by Christ and the apostles. To see this more clearly, we have only to examine the nature and extent of that jurisdiction, which Christ communicated to his apostles; and which they exercised in opposition to the Majesty of the Roman empire. The peculiar and essential jurisdiction of the church of Christ is of a spiritual nature, delivered by our Saviour to his apostles in these words: *all power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.* (St. Matthew, c. 28. v. 18, 19, 20). Here is evidently bestowed the authority to teach the mysteries of faith, and the precepts of morality; for both these points were the subjects of the frequent communications of Christ with his apostles. He likewise conferred on them the power of remitting sin, and of passing sentence on sinners, when he said: *Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whosoever sins ye re-*

*mit, they are remitted unto them; and whose ever sins ye retain, they are retained.* (St. John c. 20. v. 22, 23). And, again. *Moreover, if thy brother should trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone; if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more; and if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church, but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican.* (St. Matthew, c. 18. v. 15, 16, 17, 18.) *Verily I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.* Here we have the extent of the peculiar and essential jurisdiction of the church of Christ. In these passages is clearly bestowed a power of teaching whatever Christ has commanded us to believe, or to do; and, consequently, a power of explaining his doctrine, of checking the audacity of those who attempt to teach new doctrines, or to alter what has been delivered; a power of assembling the faithful for prayer and instruction; of giving them pastors and public ministers, and of deposing those who are unworthy of their charge; of judging sinners, and of distinguishing those who are to be absolved, from those who are not properly disposed for absolution; and, finally, of cutting off from the body of the church refractory and incorrigible members. It is worthy of observation, Sir, that this essential jurisdiction, given by Christ to his church, was not conferred on the civil governors of the time, on Tiberius, on Herod, on Pontius Pilate, but on the apostles, and on their successors to the end of time; for his church was to remain till the end of the world, as it incontestibly appears from his words, which I before cited. The power thus communicated was exercised by the apostles; who preached, who taught, who adjusted differences by virtue of this authority, as it appears from the council held by them at Jerusalem (The Acts, c. 15); who used the sword of excommunication. Did not St. Paul, to use his own words, *with the power of our Lord, deliver the industrious Corinthian unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit might be saved?* They did more. They formed an hierarchy, by ordaining bishops, priests, and deacons for the government and instruction of the faithful. St. Peter established the Sees of Antioch and Rome; and from him to the present Pope, there has been, for the space of 18 hundred years, a constant and uninterrupted succession of pastors, exercising the spiritual power, which they derived from Christ. This fact is as incontrovertible, as the regular succession of monarchs on the throne of England from Egbert to his present Majesty. It is moreover, to be remarked, that the apostles used this spiritual authority, not with the *connivance of the civil power*, but in opposition to its edicts, and in defiance of its menaces; they underwent imprisonment, exile, torments, death in every form with unparalleled constancy, rather than relinquish the commission which they had received to preach the gospel. Persecution assailed the growing church for the space of 300 years, when bigotry was finally disarmed, and its foes became its most zealous protectors. Now, Sir, after this plain statement, I appeal to the noble and learned lord, I appeal to all those, who entertain the smallest apprehension of the power of the Pope, whether this spiritual authority in question, can be stigmatized as a *foreign jurisdiction, inconsistent with the sovereignty of states*, any more than the same authority in the hands of the apostles? The powers used by the apostles, and by their Catholic successors, are precisely of the same nature, and directed to the same objects. As to the civil pretensions of the Pope's, they have been long ago relinquished, and never constituted any part of their religion. If after this, it be maintained, that the renunciation of all spiritual authority vested in the Pope, or any other person whatever, is a necessary duty, which a subject owes to the independence of his own country, it will inevitably follow, that the apostles and primitive pastors, intrenched on the independence of Rome by raising a foreign jurisdiction, and justly suffered, not as martyrs to truth, but as traitors to their country. No alternative is therefore left to the enemies of the Pope's spiritual power, but either to relinquish their idle objections, or openly to declare themselves hostile to the cause of the apostles and primitive pastors, approvers, and advocates of the conduct of Nero, Domitian, Decius, Diocletian; and, consequently, the nations of infidelity. If, Sir, you reply, that it is not clear, that the Pope has derived any power from the apostles, my answer is, that the Catholics think it perfectly incontestible; they say, and they say with truth, that a constant succession of pastors from St. Peter to the present Pope is an historical fact, which admits of no doubt; and, consequently, that you might with equal reason deny, that George III. who sits on the throne of Egbert, has not inherited from that monarch the power of governing this country. I hope this statement of the nature and extent of the spiritual power, residing in the Catholic church,

will dissipate the unfounded alarms which have been raised on the subject, and completely silence the illiberal clamour, so insidiously kept up for a time against the Catholic hierarchy of Ireland. These bishops certainly do not exceed the limits of that spiritual power, employed by the primitive pastors of the church; and in some instances, they do not proceed so far. We find St. Paul, (1 Corinth. c. 6.) forbidding the Christians of his time to go to law with each other, What did the Roman prætors, and the ministers of public justice say to this? The punishment of excommunication, on which so much has been said, was inflicted with at least as much severity and terror, as it can be by any Catholic bishops of the present time.—I am extremely sorry to find, from your report of the debates, that a very respectable and learned prelate joined in the furious outcry which was raised in a certain quarter against the Catholic hierarchy of Ireland. That excellent man clearly denies the Catholic bishops any claim to jurisdiction; of course every act, which they perform in the exercise of their functions, is null and invalid. "The power of order," says he, "the Roman Catholic prelates pos-"sess. But the power of jurisdiction does "not necessarily attach to the power of or-"der. A man may be a bishop, and yet it "follows not of necessity that he is bishop "of a diocese. The only competent autho-"rity to give the power of episcopal juris-"diction in this kingdom, is the crown." (Speech of the Bishop of St. Asaph, p. 800.) The distinction betweeen the power of order, and the power of jurisdiction is perfectly just. But the source of the jurisdiction exercised by the Catholic bishops, is the only one, through which *spiritual* authority can be conveyed. For it is derived from pastors, to whom from the days of the apostles an unbroken succession has been maintained. St. Paul never received his authority to preach from the civil government of Rome. *Dictum sapienti sat est.*—But, it may be said, do not the Catholic bishops in countries in communion with the See of Rome, virtually surrender these high notions of papal supremacy? Is not Napoleon at this day as much head of that portion of the Catholics in his dominions, as his present Majesty is head of the church of England? Napoleon is unquestionably the protector of the Catholic church existing in the territories of France; and, by an agreement or concordat, between himself and the Pope, possesses all that influence and authority, which can be extended to the civil power. But there is one *great and essential* point of difference between George and Napoleon; the former acknowledges no dependence on any authority whatever; the latter recognizes the spiritual power of the Pope, as vicar of Christ, and suffers his bishops to receive from him canonical institution, by virtue of which they are empowered to perform spiritual functions. This is a landmark which is never to be removed, without quitting the communion of the Catholic church. When the noble and learned lord, exhorts the Catholics of the United Kingdom to *redeem themselves from the bondage and thraldom, under which they have so long groaned*, he, perhaps, was not aware, that he was urging them to direct and open apostacy; to the surrender of an article, which *all* Catholics regard as an *essential* bond of communion. The advice, I presume, was conscientiously given; and, I am confident that it will be as conscientiously rejected.—I have been, Sir, somewhat diffuse on the subject of the Pope's power, as I was willing to afford the fullest information on the point, and to remove every shadow of doubt and apprehension from the minds of my countrymen. If what I have here written, be compared with all I have said on the subject in my former letters, I trust that it will be found completely to have answered the purpose; and that the harmless supremacy of the Pope, which excites no alarms in the surrounding nations of Europe, as jealous of their independence as we can be, will no longer be considered as a bugbear in Britain. There are, in the course of your reports on the Catholic question, many other remarks, for I cannot call them arguments, which might be made subjects of discussion. But I have already trespassed too long on your patience, and have signified my intention of closing our correspondence with this letter. The times are sufficiently critical to induce the government to inflame the zeal and loyalty of four millions of people, by additional motives of interest; and every degree of necessary information on this important question is now before the public. I, therefore, leave this concern to the liberality and honour of those able men, who now fill the first offices of the state; I remain fully confident that Lord Grenville, an upright and dignified character, and an excellent statesman, Mr. Fox, whose abilities are only equalled by the liberality of his mind, and the other distinguished persons, associated with them in the ministry, will all concur in realising the hopes of the Catholics, whenever it can be done with effect. To *their* judgment the Catholics of Ireland will undoubtedly have the good sense to leave the business, with

the most perfect reliance on their integrity and honour. Having, Sir, during the course of two years, written several letters in your Register, on the Catholic question, and other topics closely connected with it, I cannot dismiss this my last communication, without begging you to accept my grateful acknowledgments for your kindness in receiving my performances, and your promptitude in giving them to the public. With my best wishes, that success may attend your useful pursuits, and ingenious researches, I beg leave to drop the curtain, and close the labours of THE BRITISH OBSERVER.——*Feb.* 15, 1806.

---

DR. M'ARTHUR.

SIR;—I am reluctantly compelled by the long episodical note, which the Honourable Cochrane Johnstone has introduced into his attack on the Earl of Moira in your Political Register of the 30th ultimo, (p p. 253 et seq.) once more to intrude myself on the public. —Your readers will observe, on comparing Mr. Johnstone's original statement, (page 203, and again inserted, page 271), with my answer to his letter of the 5th May, which he has after being called upon now given (page 330.) 1st., That this answer was drawn from me by his letter of the same date: *two days after* he had been officially informed by Colonel Gordon, that His Royal Highness the Duke of York, did not consider himself justified in recommending him for the rank of Major General; that this fact was concealed from me; and that his object in writing to me could be no other, than to make me without my knowledge the instrument of committing Colonel Gordon with the Duke of York. 2dly., That so completely ignorant was I, of this His Royal Highnesses determination as to conclude the said letter *with my best wishes for Mr. Johnstone's success.* 3dly., That I did not in the most remote degree mention Lord Hutchinson as having been one of the party with Colonel Gordon. 4thly., That it was not *the day before*, but six or seven weeks prior to Mr. Johnstone's having seen the Earl of Moira, that I had dined in company with Colonel Gordon. 5thly., That Mr. Johnstone had intimation that I had no further knowledge of the Colonel Gordon to whom I alluded, than what was derived from the solitary circumstance of having once met him at a dinner-party. And, lastly, supposing but by no means admitting, Mr. Johnstone to be justifiable in publishing what had passed, it was evidently his duty under the explanation given to have identified the officer of whom I spoke, before making the assertion he did, first to the Earl of Moira, and then to the public through your paper.—As to the circumstance whether it was I who wished Mr. Johnstone might soon be gazetted, or Colonel Gordon who thought it probable he would obtain his rank as Major General, it is too immaterial to be dwelt upon.—In return to the *pleasantry* of the Honorable Gentleman, with which he *meant* no doubt to wound my feelings, I fear his mind at present is but little affected by sensations of that kind; such as he may enjoy, I have no disposition to deprive him of. It may, however, be a *favor* to remind him, that the whole of his irony may be said to rest on the advantage which he supposes himself to be possessed of in the adventitious circumstance of his *having happened to be made the son of an Earl.*—Noble birth is in the first instance highly favourable to the possessor, but when used as the means of beating down a *Commoner* it is now universally laughed at. That such has been the conduct of the Honourable Cochrane Johnstone, witness the whole of what he has written against me and the whole of my life which has given no ground for it; and witness too, his *studied attention* to the Earl of Moira, even in the midst of an attack on that nobleman, and when charging his lordship (page 353) "with having tacitly if not "expressly abandoned him in compliance to "the Duke of York, towards whom his "lordship now discovered his profound "respect." While against me, a person whom he acknowledges (page 385) "to "have been with *perfect sincerity* a friend "to his cause, *and to be so still (as he be-* "*lieves) at the bottom of my heart,*" his utmost virulence is exerted;—even my literary labours are attempted to be run down and swept away in a vortex, merely because I had in strict justice been compelled to vindicate Colonel Gordon and myself from a charge prematurely and erroneously brought forward by Mr. Johnstone; and of which without my knowledge he had publicly named me the author.—With respect to the irrelevant matter he has introduced in his usual tone of irony, or what he terms the "paragraphical advertisement" of my degree of LL.D. from the university of Edinburgh, I shall only observe, that the notice was penned there, by a truly learned and respectable member of that university, to whom I am a stranger, and by his desire published in the Edinburgh papers without my knowledge and even before I knew that the degree had been conferred upon me; by his recommendation also, it was copied agreeably to custom into some of the London

papers, at the same time purporting what Mr. Johnstone has studiously concealed, that it was extracted from *the Edinburgh Courant of August 2d.*—Mr. Johnstone may continue to sneer at the first university *in his native country*, where probably he was educated; but its fame is too well known to be at all affected by any insinuation that he, or any individual can throw out: and with respect to myself, it will be the pride of my life in having been deemed worthy by the university of Edinburgh, of the degree so handsomely conferred upon me.—I now take my leave, certainly desirous that I may not be provoked by any farther rudeness to continue this controversy, being deeply impressed with that excellent advice of Fingal to Oscar, "*Never to search for the battle, "nor shun it when it comes.*" I still wish Mr. Johnstone no harm, but the contrary; and would therefore recommend it to him not in future unnecessarily at least, to hazard the making of enemies, when he may keep friends.—I am, Sir, your most obedient servant, JOHN M'ARTHUR.—*Hinton, near Horndean Hants, September 6, 1806.*

---

## DOMESTIC OFFICIAL PAPER.

VICTORY IN CALABRIA ——*From the London Gazette Extraordinary, dated Friday, September 5, 1806.*

Downing Street, Sept. 4, 1806.—A dispatch has been this day received by the right honorable William Windham, one of his Majesty's principal Secretaries of State, from Major General Sir John Stuart, commanding his Majesty's troops acting in Calabria, of which the following is a copy: Camp on the Plain of Maida, July 6, 1806. —Sir; It is with the most heartfelt satisfaction that I have the honor of reporting to you, for the information of his Majesty, the particulars of an action, in which the French army quartered in this province have sustained a signal defeat by the troops under my command.—General Regnier, having been apprised of our disembarkation at St. Eufemia, appears to have made a rapid march from Reggio, uniting, as he advanced, his detached corps, for the purpose of attacking, and with his characteristic confidence, of defeating us.—On the afternoon of the 3d instant, I received intelligence that he had that day encamped near Maida, about ten miles distant from our position, that his force consisted at the moment of about four thousand infantry and three hundred cavalry, together with four pieces of artillery, and that he was in expectation of being joined within a day or two by three thousand more troops who were marching after him in a second division.—I determined therefore to advance towards his position, and, having left four companies of Watteville's regiment under Major Fisher to protect the stores, and occupy a work which had been thrown up at our landing place, the body of the army marched the next morning according to the following detail.

Advanced Corps.—Lieut. Colonel Kempt, with two four-pounders.
Light infantry battalion.
Detachment Royal Corsican Rangers.
Detachment Royal Sicilian Volunteers.
1st Brigade.—Brigadier General Cole, with three four pounders.
The Grenadier Battalion.
27th Regiment.
2d Brigade.—Brigadier General Ackland, with three four pounders.
78th Regiment.
81st Regiment.
3d Brigade.—Colonel Oswald, with two four pounders.
58th Regiment.
Watteville's Regiment, five companies.
20th Regiment, Lieutenant Colonel Ross, landed during the action.
Reserve of Artillery.—Major Lemoine.
4 Six-pounders and 2 Howitzers.
Total.—Rank and file, including the Royal Artillery, 4795.

General Regnier was encamped on the side of a woody hill, below the village of Maida, sloping into the plain of St. Eufemia; his flanks were strengthened by a thick impervious underwood. The Amato, a river perfectly fordable, but of which the sides are extremely marshy, ran along his front; my approach to him from the sea side (along the borders of which, I directed my march, until I had nearly turned his left) was across a spacious plain, which gave him every opportunity of minutely observing my movements.—After some loose firing of the flankers to cover the deploiements of the two armies, by nine o'clock in the morning the opposing fronts were warmly engaged, when the prowess of the rival nations seemed now fairly to be at trial before the world, and the superiority was greatly and gloriously decided to be our own.—The corps which found the right of the advanced line, was the battalion of light infantry commanded by Lieutenant Colonel Kempt, consisting of the light companies of the 20th, 27th, 35th, 58th, 61st, 81st and Watteville's, together with one hundred and fifty chosen battalion men of the 35th regiment, under Major Robinson. Directly opposed to them, was the favourite French regiment the 1re Légère. The two corps at the

distance of about one hundred yards fired reciprocally a few rounds, when, as if by mutual agreement, the firing was suspended, and in close compact order and awful silence, they advanced towards each other, until their bayonets began to cross. At this momentous crisis the enemy became appalled. They broke, and endeavoured to fly, but it was too late; they were overtaken with the most dreadful slaughter.—Brigadier General Ackland, whose brigade was immediately on the left of the light infantry, with great spirit availed himself of this favorable moment to press instantly forward upon the corps in his front; the brave 78th regiment, commanded by Lieutenant Colonel Macleod, and the 81st regimeut, under Major Plenderleath, both distinguished themselves on this occasion. The enemy fled with dismay and disorder before them, leaving the plain covered with their dead and wounded.—The enemy thus completely discomfited on their left, began to make a new effort with their right, in the hopes of recovering the day. They were resisted most gallantly by the brigade under Brtgadier General Cole. Nothing could shake the undaunted firmness of the grenadiers under Lieutenant Colonel Smith. The cavalry, successively repelled from before their front, made an effort to turn their left, when Lieutenant Colonel Ross, who had that morning landed from Messina with the 20th regiment, and was coming up to the army during the action, having observed the movement, threw his regiment opportunely into a small cover upon their flank, and by a heavy and well directed fire, entirely disconcerted this attempt.—This was the last feeble struggle of the enemy, who now, astonished and dismayed by the intrepidity with which they were assailed, began precipitately to retire, leaving the field covered with carnage. Above seven hundred bodies of their dead have been buried upon the ground.—The wounded and prisoners already in our hands (among which are General Compère, and an Aid-de-Camp, the Lieutenant Colonel of the Swiss regiment, and a long list of officers of different ranks) amount to above one thousand. There are also above one thousand men left in Monteleone and the different posts between this and Reggio, who have mostly notified their readiness to surrender, whenever a British force shall be sent to receive their submission, and to protect them from the fury of the people. — The peasantry are hourly bringing in fugitives, who dispersed in the woods and mountains after the battle. In short never has the pride of our presumptuous enemy been more severely humbled, nor the superiority of the British troops more gloriously proved, than in the events of this memorable day.——His Majesty may, perhaps, still deign to appreciate more highly the achievements of this little army, when it is known that the second division which the enemy were said to be expecting had all joined them the night before the action; no statement that I have heard of their numbers places them at a less calculation than seven thousand men.—Our victorious infantry continued the pursuit of the routed enemy so long as they were able; but as the latter dispersed in every direction, and we were under the necessity of preserving our order, the trial of speed became unequal.—The total loss occasioned to the enemy by this conflict cannot be less than four thousand men. When I oppose to the above our own small comparative loss, as underneath detailed, his Majesty will, I hope, discern in the fact, the happy effects of that establshed discipline to which we owe the triumphs by which our army has been latterly so highly distinguished.—I am now beginning my march southward preparatory to my return to Sicily, for which station I shall re-embark with the army, as soon as his Sicilian Majesty shall have arranged a disposition of his own forces to secure those advantages which have been gained by the present expedition.—There seldom has happened an action in which the zeal and personal exertions of individuals were so imperiously called for as in the present; seldom an occasion where a general had a fairer opportunity of observing them. —The general officers, and those who commanded regiments, will feel a stronger test of their merits in the circumstances that have been detailed of their conduct, than in any eulogium I could presume to pass upon them.—The 58th and Watteville's regiment, commanded by Lieut.-Cols. Johnston and Watteville, which formed the reserve, under Colonel Oswald were ably directed in their application to that essential duty.—The judgment and effect with which our artillery was directed br Major Lemoine, was, in our dearth of cavalry, of most essential use; and I have a pleasure in reporting the effective services of that valuable and distinguished corps.—To the several departments of the army, every acknowledgement is due; but to no officer, am I bound to express them so fully, on my part, as to Lieutenant-Colonel Bunbury, the deputy quarter-master general, to whose zeal and activity, and able arrangements in the important branch of service which he directs, the army as well as myself are under every

marked obligation.—From Captain Tomlin the acting head of the adjutant-general's department, and from the officers of my own family, I have received much active assistance. Among the latter I am to mention Lieutenant-Colonel Moore of the 23d light dragoons, who being in Sicily for his health at the time of our departure, solicited permission to accompany me on this expedition; he was wounded in the execution of my orders.—From the medical department under the direction of Mr. Grieves, the deputy inspector, I am to acknowledge much professional, attention the more so as their labours have been greatly accumulated by the number of wounded prisoners who become with our own, the subject of their care. The scene of action was too far from the sea to enable us to derive any direct co-operation from the Navy: but Admiral Sir Sidney Smith, who had arrived in the Bay the evening before the action, had directed such a disposition of ships and gun-boats as would have greatly favoured us, had events obliged us to retire. The solicitude however of every part of the navy to be of use to us, the promptitude with which the seamen hastened on shore with our supplies, their anxiety to assist our wounded, and the tenderness with which they treated them, would have been an affecting circumstance to observers even the most indifferent. To me it was particularly so.—Captain Fellowes, of His Majesty's Ship Apollo, has been specially attached to this expedition by the Rear Admiral; and, in every circumstance of professional service, I beg leave to mention our grateful obligations to this officer, as well as to Captains Cocket and Watson, agents of transports, who acted under his orders.—Captain Bulkely, my Aide-de-Camp, who will have the honor of presenting this letter to you, has attended me throughout the whole of the services in the Mediterranean, and will therefore be able to give you every additional information on the subject of my present communication. I have the honor to be, &c. J. STUART, Maj. Gen.

Return of killed and wounded of the British troops under the command of Major-General Sir John Stuart, in the battle on the Plains of St. Euphemia, near Madia, 4th July 1806.

Royal Artillery. 2 horses killed; 3 gunners wounded.—Grenadier batallion. 4 rank and file killed; 1 officer, 1 serjeant. 25 rank and file wounded.—Light infantry battalion. 1 officer, 7 rank and file killed; 1 officer, 1 drummer, 41 rank and file wounded.—20th foot. 1 rank and file killed; 1 drummer, 5 rank and file wounded.—27th foot, 1st batt 6 rank and file killed; 1 serjeant, 45 rank and file wounded.—58th foot, 1st batt. 2 rank and file wounded.—78th foot, 2d batt. 4 rank and file killed; 7 officers, 4 serjeants, 1 drummer, 09 rank and file wounded.—81st foot, 1st batt. 3 serjeants, 16 rank and file killed; 2 officers, 1 serjeant, 62 rank and file wounded. —Regiment of Watteville —3 rank and file wounded.—Royal Corsican Rangers.—3 rank and file killed; 5 rank and file wounded.—Total. 1 officer, 3 serjeants, 41 rank and file killed; 11 officers, 8 serjeants, 2 drummers, 261 rank and file wounded.—*Names of officers killed and wounded.*—Killed. Light infantry batt. Captain M'Leane, of 20th foot.—Wounded. Grenadier batt. Major Hammil, of Royal regiment of Malta.—Light infantry batt. Major Paulett, of 44th foot, severely.—78th foot, 2d batt. Lieutenant-Colonel M'Leod; Major D. Stuart; Captains D. M'Pherson and D. M'Gregor; Lieutenant James M'Kay; Ensigns Colin M'Kenzie and Peter M'Gregor. —81st foot, 1st batt. Captain Waterhouse; Lieutenant and Adjutant Ginger.——Staff. Lieutenant-Colonel Moore, of 23d light dragoons, acting Aide-de-Camp to Major-General Sir John Stuart. (Signed) R. TOMLIS, Assist. Adj. Gen.

---

*Supplement to the London Gazette Extraordinary, of Friday, September 5, 1806.—Sunday, September 7, 1806.—Dated Downing Street, September 6. 1806.*

A Dispatch, of which the following is an Extract, was this day received by the Right Hon. Charles James Fox, His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, from Hugh Elliot, Esq. late His Majesty's Envoy Extraordinary, and Minister Plenipotentiary at the Court of his Sicilian Majesty.

Extract of a Dispatch from Hugh Elliot, Esq. to the Right Hon. Charles James Fox, dated Palermo, 5th August, 1806.

SIR;—I enclose herewith the copy of a letter of the 3d of August, which I have received this day from Sir John Stuart.—By the surrender of Cotrone, and the retreat of both General Verdier and General Regnier from upper and lower Calabria, those provinces are now restored to their legal Sovereign.—The battle of Maida, upon the 4th of July, will long be recorded in this part of Europe as a memorable proof of the superiority of British courage and discipline.—Of the nine thousand men which General Regnier commanded in the province of Calabria Ulterior, not more than three thou-

sand are left to attempt their retreat towards Puglia; the remainder are all either killed, wounded, or made prisoners.—Every fort along the coasts, all the depots of stores, ammunition, and artillery, prepared for the attacking of Sicily, are become the prey of the victors; and, what perhaps may be considered as even of still more consequence than those advantages, an indelible impression is established of the superior bravery and discipline of the British troops—There is not perhaps to be found in the annals of military transactions, an enterprize prepared with more deliberate reflection, or executed with greater decision, promptitude, and success, than the late invasion of Calabria, by Sir John Stuart.

Extract of a Dispatch from Major General Sir John Stuart, to Hugh Elliot, Esq., dated Messina, 3d August, 1806.

Having occasion to send an express to my Aide-de-Camp, Captain Bulkely, at Palermo, I avail myself of the opportunity to acquaint you with another fortunate result of our auspicious day at Maida.—Cotrone with all its stores, magazines, &c. and six hundred troops, (now prisoners), capitulated on Wednesday evening last to the land and naval forces of its Britannic Majesty, under Lieutenant Colonel M'Leod, of the 78th regiment, and Captain Hoste of his Majesty's frigate Amphion, who were assisted in their operations against that place, and upon the adjacent coasts, by the gun-boats of his Sicilian Majesty. Three hundred prisoners, who prove to be survivors of the wounded, after the action of the 4th ultimo, are already arrived in this port.—General Regnier, who had endeavoured to hold his position, under much embarrassment for some time past, between Cotrone and Catanzaro, has retreated precipitately towards Tarento; and it was reported when the transport left Cotrone, that he had been attacked by the masse, and had lost six or seven hundred of his flying people.—I am now to congratulate you on the total evacuation of Calabria Ultra, in which single province, previous to the action of the 4th, we have every certainty that the enemy had a distributed force of at least nine thousand men; of these, when General Regnier quitted his position near Cotrone, certainly not three thousand remained. The losses of the French in Upper Calabria have also borne a proportion.—A great deal of heavy ordnance, lately transported by the French to Cotrone, besides what was found mounted on the Castle, amounting in the whole to about 40 pieces, have fallen into our hands.

Downing Street, 6th September, 1806.—A Dispatch, of which the following is a copy, has been received by the Right Hon. William Windham, one of his Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State, from General the Right Hon H. E. Fox, Commander of his Majesty's Forces in the Mediterranean.

Messena, 3d August, 1806.—SIR;—I have the honour of enclosing to you the Capitulation of Cotrone, as well as Extracts of two letters received this day from Lieutenant Colonel M'Leod of the 78th Regiment, and addressed to Major General Sir John Stuart, who had detached that Officer for the purpose of giving support to the armed peasantry on the adjacent coast, and of making an attack on that place itself.—Lieutenant Colonel M'Leod appears to have conducted himself with the greatest judgment and activity in this service, and to have received the most ready co-operation and essential assistance from Captain Hoste, of his Majesty's ship Amphion, who has all along acted in conjunction with him.—I have the honour to be, &c.—(Signed) H. E. Fox.—Right Hon. W. Windham, &c. &c.

Extract of a Letter from Lieutenant-Colonel M'Leod, to Major-General Sir John Stuart, dated Amphion Frigate, off Cotrone. 27th July, 1806.

By the letter I had the honour of addressing to you on the 24th instant, accompanying the duplicates of my letters of the preceding evening, you will be aware that it was my intention to move, in conjunction with Captain Hoste's squadron, to this place on the following day, under an impression that a feint on the enemy's rear, and this his sole remaining dépôt, would induce him to divide his force, and of course make it so much the more easy for the Chiefs of the Masse to succeed in their projected attacks on his position at Catanzaro. The fleet got under weigh accordingly at eight o'clock, *p. m.* and the following morning (although a considerable distance from the shore) I had the satisfaction to observe the French army in full retreat towards Cotrone; as their route or road appeared to run nearly parallel to, and within gun-shot of the beach, and to be bounded on the opposite side by a chain of mountains, no better opportunity could be offered, apparently, for an effectual co-operation with the masse.

*To be Continued.*

Printed by Cox and Baylis, No. 75, Great Queen Street, and published by R. Bahaw, Bow Street Covent Garden where former Numbers may be had; sold also by J. Budd, Crown and Mitre, Pall Mall.